PALGO JOURNAL OF EDUCATION RESEARCH(PJER)

http://www.palgojournals.org/PJER/Index.htm

REVIEWERS GUIDE

PART A: *Editorial Office Only*

MANUSCRIPT REVIEW

Title: Effectiveness of Augmented Reality Visual Alerts on Communication and Navigation for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Individuals in Oyo State, Nigeria

---

RATINGS

Criterion	Rating
Originality	3 (Fair)
Contribution to the Field	3 (Fair)
Technical Quality	3 (Fair)
Clarity of Presentation	2 (Good)
Depth of Research	3 (Fair)

Scale: 1 = Excellent, 2 = Good, 3 = Fair, 4 = Poor

GENERAL COMMENT

This manuscript addresses an important topic—accessibility for Deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals in Nigeria—and demonstrates genuine commitment to inclusion. The writing is generally clear and well-organized. However, there is a fundamental problem: **this paper has no methodology or results sections**. It reads as a position paper or literature review, not an empirical research study. The title mentions "Oyo State" but contains no Oyo State-specific data. Before publication, you must either (1) add actual research methodology and results, or (2) reframe it as a conceptual/review paper with appropriate methods for literature synthesis.

SECTION-BY-SECTION COMMENTS

ABSTRACT

Strengths: Clear writing, acknowledges counter-arguments, good contextualization.

Improvements needed:

- → Does not indicate whether this is empirical research, a review, or a position paper—please clarify

---

INTRODUCTION

Strengths: Well-written, strong rationale, good connection to SDGs and UNCRPD, effective use of Nigerian context.

Improvements needed:

- → **Add clear research questions or objectives.** What specific questions will this paper answer?
- → **Why "Oyo State"?** The title is specific to Oyo State, but the paper contains no Oyo State data, statistics, or case studies. Either add Oyo State-specific content or remove it from the title.
- → Soften overly assertive language. Example: "the question, then, is not whether AR is effective but how quickly..." This assumes effectiveness without evidence from *your* study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Note: Your paper does not label any section as "Literature Review," but sections like "AR and Communication Enhancement" function as one.

Strengths: Comprehensive coverage of AR applications, good thematic organization.

Improvements needed:

- → **Several citations are missing from your reference list.** Examples: Nweke & Adeyemi (2023), Okonkwo & Eze (2022), Ogunleye & Bello (2023), Chukwuma & Adebanjo (2024), Okoro & Ibrahim (2022), Adeyemi & Kolawole (2023), Okafor & Salami (2024). **Every in-text citation must appear in the references.**
- → Add more Nigerian-specific sources and examples
- → Include more technical details about how AR systems actually work

---

METHODOLOGY

CRITICAL ISSUE: THIS SECTION IS COMPLETELY MISSING.

This is the most serious problem. Without methodology, your paper cannot be evaluated as research.

What you need to add:

- → What type of paper is this? Literature review? Position paper? Conceptual framework?
- → If it's a literature review, describe: What databases did you search? What were your search terms? What were your inclusion/exclusion criteria? How did you analyze the literature?
- → If you conducted actual research in Oyo State: What was your research design? Who were your participants? How did you collect data? What instruments did you use? How did you analyze it?
- → Include ethical approval information

Without this section, the paper cannot be published as a research article.

RESULTS

CRITICAL ISSUE: THIS SECTION IS ALSO COMPLETELY MISSING.

What you need to add:

- → If this is empirical research: Present your findings with tables, figures, statistics, or themes
- → If this is a literature review: Present a systematic synthesis of what you found across studies
- → Currently, you have discussion-style sections but no actual results from your own work

The sections titled "AR and Communication Enhancement," "AR and Navigation/Safety," and "Educational Implications" are discussion topics, not results.

DISCUSSION

Strengths: Thoughtful analysis, considers counter-arguments (cost, cultural acceptance), good balance.

Improvements needed:

- → Counter-arguments are presented separately (in their own sections). Consider integrating critiques more naturally throughout the discussion.
- → Many claims need citations or are cited to sources not in your reference list

---

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Strengths: Clear summary, practical recommendations.

Improvements needed:

- → Your conclusion states "AR visual alerts are both effective and essential" but you have not conducted research proving this
- → Soften claims: "This paper argues that AR has significant potential..." rather than declaring effectiveness without evidence

---

REFERENCES

Strengths: Recent sources, includes some Nigerian authors, mix of international perspectives.

CRITICAL PROBLEMS:

- → **Many in-text citations are missing from the reference list.** This must be fixed. See full list under "Literature Review" section above.
- Kindly cite all the references highlighted in yellow

GRAMMATICAL ERRORS

Overall English is good. Minor issues:

DECISION

MAJOR REVISION REQUIRED

What this means: Your paper addresses an important topic, but it cannot be published in its current form because it is missing essential research components (methodology and results). You have two options:

OPTION 1: Reframe as a Conceptual/Position Paper

✓ Change title to remove "Oyo State" or add Oyo State-specific content
✓ Add methodology section describing your literature review approach
✓ Clearly label this as a position paper or conceptual framework
✓ Fix all missing citations
✓ Soften claims about "effectiveness" to "potential effectiveness"

OPTION 2: Conduct Actual Research

✓ Design and implement a study in Oyo State (surveys, interviews, pilot program, etc.)
✓ Add complete methodology section
✓ Collect and present original data in results section
✓ Rewrite discussion to interpret *your* findings
✓ Keep current content as literature review/background

MOST IMPORTANT FIXES

1. ✓ **Add methodology section** (MUST DO)
2. ✓ **Add results section OR reframe as conceptual paper** (MUST DO)
3. ✓ **Fix all missing references** (MUST DO)
4. ✓ **Add limitations section** (MUST DO)
5. ✓ **Remove "Oyo State" from title OR add Oyo State-specific content** (MUST DO)

FINAL COMMENTS

Your commitment to accessibility for Deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals in Nigeria is commendable, and this topic deserves attention. The writing demonstrates good understanding of AR technology and its potential applications.

The main issue is structural: You've written a thoughtful position paper but submitted it as if it were an empirical research study. This creates confusion about what you actually did.

Here's what needs to happen:

- Decide which type of paper this will be (conceptual or empirical)
- Add the missing sections (methodology, results)
- Fix citation
- Align your title with your actual content

Once you address these fundamental issues, your paper can make a valuable contribution to accessibility discourse in Africa. The ideas are good—they just need the proper research framework.

Good luck with your revisions!

Reviewer Recommendation: Major Revision Required
Review Date: September 30, 2025